arXiv:cond-mat/0309555v1 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci] 24 Sep 2003

Non conservation of the magnetization current across magnetic hetero-structures

S. T. Chui and Z. F. Lin

Bartol Research Institute, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

Abstract

We show that when the magnetizations on opposite sides of a junction are not collinear, the magnetization current is not conserved as the junction is crossed. Thus the usual treatment of this problem needs to be modified. We argue that this is due to an implicit assumption of an external torque that is required to clamp the magnetization in place. The physical consequence of this is explored.

PACS numbers: PACS numbers:73.40.-c,71.70.Ej,75.25.+z

There is much recent interest in spin polarized transport in heterostructures such as tunnel junctions and metallic multilayers. A general approach to these types of problems is to solve for the steady state solutions. To incorporate the transmission and reflection of the injecting current at the interface, it is necessary to solve the boundary value problem. Central to treating the transmission and the reflection is how the charge current J and magnetization current $J_{\mathbf{M}}$ go from one side of the heterostructure to the next. For a simple heterostructure with no magnetic impurities both types of currents are usually assumed to be conserved as they go across the barrier. An equation that is usually employed in the treatment of this phenomena is of the form[1]

$$J_{\mathbf{M}} = \sum_s (\alpha_s \mu_{Ls} - \beta_s \mu_{Rs}) \tag{1}$$

where α, β are coefficients, $\mu_{L(R)s}$ are the chemical potentials of the electrons of spin channel s on the left (right) of the junction. In this equation, it is assumed that $J_{\mathbf{M}}$ is unique because it is conserved. Recently, it was discovered that when the magnetizations on opposite sides of a metallic barrier structure are noncollinear, a current can induce torques on the magnetizations[2, 3, 4, 5]. This motivated us to examine the boundary condition across a heterostructure more closely. We consider the strong barrier limit corresponding to tunnel junctions and the weak barrier limit with zero interface resistance, corresponding to metallic multilayers. We find that when the magnetizations on opposite sides of the barrier are noncollinear, the magnetization current is **not** conserved as it goes across the barrier. Thus eq. (1) cannot always be used. An examination of the physics suggests that **implicit** in the assumption of the noncollinear magnetizations is a torque to maintain the orientation of the magnetization. It is this torque which changes the magnetization current. We now discuss our results in detail.

We first remind the reader the meaning of the direction of magnetization. The general quantum statistical properties of a system is described by the density matrix ρ. The general state of magnetization is therefore described by the 2×2 polarization matrix $|M_0|\rho$ where $|M_0|$ is the magnitude of the magnetization. As is well known[6] there is always a direction $\mathbf{M}$ so that $\rho = (1 + \sigma \cdot \mathbf{M})$ where σ are the Pauli matrices $(\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$. The density matrix is diagonal along $\mathbf{M}$. We call this the direction of magnetization. Along this direction, the off-diagonal components of the density matrix are zero and there is no phase coherence between the spin up and the spin down states.

We next evaluate the magnetization current. For simplicity we take a one dimensional geometry where the currents are uniform in the x-z plane and move in the y direction. The evaluation of the magnetization current is simplest when we pick a coordinate system along the direction of magnetization. The magnetization current then becomes the difference between the spin up and the spin down current. We first consider the strong barrier limit of spin polarized tunnelling. Our starting point is the well accepted tunnelling Hamiltonian $H_T = \sum T_{ss'} c^+_{Lks} c_{Rqs'} + c.c.$ where s, s' are with respect to the magnetization directions on the left (labelled by the subscript L) and on the right (labelled by the subscript R). k, q are other labels for the electronic states. We are interested in the case when the directions of magnetization on opposite sides of the junction are not the same. The spins states $|s\rangle$ along one magnetization direction are related to those ($|s'\rangle$) along the other direction by a rotation matrix $\mathbf{R}_{s,s'}$. From a single particle quantum mechanical calculation we obtain an estimate of the tunnelling matrix element

$$T_{ss'} = \mathbf{R}_{ss'} \exp[\int_0^d dy(\hbar^2(U - \mu_{Ls} + \mu_{Rs'} - Vy)/2m)^{0.5}]. \tag{2}$$

where U is the tunnelling barrier, V is the external voltage, m is the electronic mass. In linear response, the term $-\mu_{Ls} + \mu_{Rs'} - Vy$ is absent.

Stimulated by the experimental success in superconductivity tunnelling there has been much studies done with this type of tunnelling Hamiltonian. We shall follow the work by Cohen, Falicov and Phillips[7], as is explained in detail in Mahan[8]. The magnetization current on the left can be evaluated from the time rate of change of the left magnetization due to the tunnelling Hamiltonian: Since $J_s = -\partial N_s/\partial t$, we get $J^L_M = -\partial(N^L_+ - N^L_-)/\partial t = -\partial M_L/\partial t$ (we have used a unit so that the Bohr magneton is 1) with a similar expression for J^R_M. The time derivative of the particle number of spin s can be evaluated as its commutator with the tunnelling Hamiltonian. The details of this for each spin component is essentially the same as in previous calculations and thus will not be repeated here. We find that[9]

$$J^L_M = 4\pi e \sum_{ss'} s|Tss'|^2(n_L(\mu_{Ls}) - n_R(\mu_{Rs'})), \tag{3}$$

and

$$J^R_M = 4\pi e \sum_{ss'} s'|Tss'|^2(n_L(\mu_{Ls}) - n_R(\mu_{Rs'})). \tag{4}$$

where μ_{Ls} ($\mu_{Rs'}$) is the chemical potential for the spin s (s') electrons on the left (right) side. $n(\mu)$ is the density of particles at energy μ.

When the directions of magnetization on both sides of the junction are collinear, T is diagonal and we find that $J_M^L = 4\pi e \sum_s s|Tss|^2(n_L(\mu_{Ls}) - n_R(\mu_{Rs})) = J_M^R$. The magnetization current is conserved. When the magnetization directions are not collinear, T is no longer diagonal. In the linear response regime, $T_{s,s'} = T_{s',s}$ is a symmetric matrix. After renaming the variables of summation, one has $J_M^L = 4\pi e \sum_{ss'} s'|Tss'|^2(n_L(\mu_{Ls'}) - n_R(\mu_{Rs}))$. $J_M^L \neq J_M^R$ because $\mu_{Ls'} \neq \mu_{Ls}$ for $s \neq s'$. The latter comes about because there is a splitting of the spin up and spin down chemical potential caused by the spin accumulation effect[10, 11] and the interplay between the charge and magnetization dipole layers[12].

J_M^L and J_M^R correspond to magnetizations along different directions. In the above we have shown that the magnitude of these two currents are not the same. A more appropriate condition would be requiring the magnetization currents for magnetizations along the same direction be equal: $J_M^L = J_M^R$. This requirement obviously cannot be satisfied because for example, on the right hand side it would require a magnetization current with a magnetization component that is perpendicular to the magnetization on the same side. From what we just derive, this is zero. The reason for the nonconservation of the magnetization current is easy to understand. Consider a wave function $|sL\rangle$ of an electron of spin s on the left. With respect to the magnetization direction on the right, this wavefunction can be written as $\sum_{s'} \mathbf{R}_{ss'}|s'R\rangle$. The corresponding density matrix for a state like this is given by

$$\rho_0 = \begin{pmatrix} R_{++}^2 & R_{+-}^2 \\ R_{+-}^2 & R_{--}^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with non-zero off-diagonal elements. But by our definition of the magnetization direction, we have assumed that after this electron has moved from the left to the right, the phase coherence between the up and down states are lost and the off-diagonal components become zero. This happens because we have **implicitly** assumed that there is some external torque that clamps the magnetization in certain directions. This torque can come from the crystalline anisotropy energy of the system, for example. It is this implicit torque that causes the magnetization current not to be conserved. In addition to this torque $t_0 = (J_M^R - J_M^L)/a\mu_B$ (μ_B is the Bohr magneton, a is atomic spacing) there may be other contributions which we shall not discuss in this paper. The reasoning in this section also applies to metallic multilayers. We turn our attention to that case next.

For metallic multilayers, eq. (3) and (4) are no longer valid. For simplicity we consider the other limit where the interface resistance is zero. For that case, the current is controlled

by the voltage drop along the metal. We assume that the length of heterostructure is less than the spin diffusion length and apply a parallel circuit model to illustrate the essential physics. In that case, we get $J_s^{L(R)} = \sigma_s^{L(R)} E^{L(R)}$ where $\sigma_s^{L(R)}$ is the conductance for spin s on the left (right). E is the electric field that drives the current. The spin current on opposite sides of the heterostructure are related by $J_{s'}^L = \sum_s |\mathbf{R}_{s,s'}|^2 J_s^R$, where, again, $\mathbf{R}$ is the rotation matrix. There are two ways that one can see this. The current on the right for spin index s' is just the number of electrons with z angular momentum s' moving past per unit time per unit area. These electrons come from the left side. The factor R^2 takes into account the probability that the z angular momentum is s'. Formally, in terms of electron creation and destruction operator the current operator is just $J_{s'}^R = \langle \sum v c_{s'}^+ c_{s'} \rangle$ where v is the velocity. Now the creation and destruction operator can be expressed with the z axis along M_L as $c_{s'} = \mathbf{R}_{s',s} c_s$, $c_{s'}^+ = \mathbf{R}_{s',s} c_s^+$. Because $\mathbf{R}$ is real, it occurs in the expressions for both the creation and destruction operator. By our assumption of the magnetization direction, we have set such terms as $< \sum c_s^+ c_t >$ with $s \neq t$ to be zero. Hence the final expressions quoted above is obtained.

It is straightforward to show that $E^{L(R)} = \sigma^{L(R)} E/(\sigma^L + \sigma^R)$ where the total conductance $\sigma^{L(R)} = \sum_s \sigma_s^{L(R)}$, $E = E^L + E^R$ measures the total voltage drop. Just as explained in the previous paragraph, because the magnetization points in different directions on opposite sides of the heterostructure, the magnetization currents are not equal to each other. The magnitudes of the two currents are equal to each other, however.

In the presence of a finite interface resistance, in linear response the current is linearly proportional to the chemical potential. We thus expect the physics to be governed by equations of the form

$$J_M^L = \sum_s r_{1s}^L \delta\mu_s^L - r_{2s}^L \delta\mu_s^R \tag{5}$$

$$J_M^R = \sum_s r_{1s}^R \delta\mu_s^L - r_{2s}^R \delta\mu_s^R \tag{6}$$

where the r's are the effective interface resistances. We next explore the physical implication of our result.

In typical experimental arrangements, only the directions of the magnetizations **far away** from the interface are specified. Because of the torque, these directions will be rotated as the interface is approached. A domain wall is created. We estimate this rotation here for a simple case. We assume that far from the interface the magnetzations are in the x-z plane

along the easy axis of anisotropy at angles θ_L, θ_R so that $\theta_R - \theta_L = \Phi$. At the interface, the left (right) magnetization has rotated by an angle $-\delta\theta_R$ ($\delta\theta_L$). From minimizing the energy, the equation governing the angle $\delta\theta$ at a distance y away from the interface is given by $J_i d^2\delta\theta/dy^2 - K_i\delta\theta = 0$ where $i = L, R$; J_i ,K_i are the exchange and anisotropy constants. The effective field H_{eff} due to the exchange, $J_i d^2\delta\theta/dy^2$, is balanced out by that due to the anisotropy, $K_i\delta\theta$. The solution of this equation is $\delta\theta(y) = \delta\theta_i exp(-|y|/d_i)$ where the magnetic length $d_i = \sqrt{J_i/K_i}$. At the interface, the effective field from the exchange becomes $Jd\delta\theta/dy$ while that from the anisotropy remain the same. The net torque $t = -\partial E/\partial\theta = M_0\delta\theta_i(K_i - J_i/d_i) = M_0\delta\theta_i[K_i - (J_iK_i)^{0.5}]$. This creates the difference in the magnetization current discussed above. We thus get $t = t_0$. $\delta\theta_i = \Delta J_M/M_0 a[K_i - (J_iK_i)^{0.5}]$. Thus we can relate $\delta\theta_i$ to ΔJ_M.

Experimental measurements are carried out under constant charge current conditions. It is necessary to relate ΔJ_M to the current J. To achieve this goal it is necessary to find solutions for the currents for each side of the junction and match them across the junction. In the treatment of spin polarized transport, we should use eq. (3) and (4) instead of eq. (1). These equations will be complemented by equations which relate the currents to the chemical potentials inside the material on either side of the junction. An example of such a equation is the modified Landau Gilbert equation with a source term equal to the divergence of the magnetization current:[13]

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}}{\partial t} - \gamma \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{H} + \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{M}} = -\frac{\delta \mathbf{M}}{\tau} \tag{7}$$

where γ is the gyromagnetic ratio, $\hat{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{M}}$ is the spin current (tensor), τ is the spin relaxation time, and $\mathbf{H}$ is the effective field describing the precession of the magnetic moments. The magnetization and charge currents are given by Fick's law as sums of terms proportional to the gradients of the charge (δn) and magnetization ($\delta\mathbf{M}$) densities and the local internal electric field. They are

$$\mathbf{J} = -\sigma\nabla V - \beta D\nabla\delta\mathbf{M}\cdot\mathbf{p}_0 - \alpha_1 D\nabla\delta n \tag{8}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{J}}_{\mathrm{M}} = -\beta\sigma\nabla V\mathbf{p}_0 - D\nabla\delta\mathbf{M} - \alpha_2\beta D\nabla\delta n\mathbf{p}_0 \tag{9}$$

where α_1 and α_2 are two phenomelogical parameters, β measures the asymmetry of the spin up and spin down current in the metal, σ is the conductivity of metal, and D is the diffusion coefficient. $\mathbf{p}_0$ is the unit vector along the direction of magnetization. V is the sum of the

electic potential V_e describing the external electric field and the local electric (screening) potential W due to other electric charges determined self-consistetly

$$W(\mathbf{r}) = \int d^3\mathbf{r}' U(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')\delta n(\mathbf{r}').$$

From these equations and the charge conservation

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = -\frac{\partial \delta n}{\partial t} \tag{10}$$

we obtain for each side of the heterostructure the charge and magnetization dipole layers at the interface given mathematically by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta n^R &= \sum_{i=1}^{4} \delta n^R_{i0} e^{-(y-\frac{d}{2})/l_i}, \\ \delta \mathbf{M}^R &= \sum_{i=1}^{4} \delta \mathbf{M}^R_{i0} e^{-(y-\frac{d}{2})/l_i} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the four length scales correspond to the screening length and the magnetic lengths for the longitudinal and left and the right rotating transverse magnetizations. d is the thickness of the barrier. The superscript R denotes the right hand side. A similar expression can be written for quantities on the left hand side. Because of the coupling between the charge and spin degrees of freedom, the length scales l_i are renormalized from their bare value. The coefficients δn_{i0} are found to depend on $\delta \mathbf{M}_{i0}$, while $\delta \mathbf{M}_{i0}$ are determined by matching the boundary condition at the interface. We illustrate this approach with a calculation of the steady state solutions in the low field linear response limit. After this boundary matching is carried out, we found for metallic multilayers in linear response a large change in the **longitudinal** component of the magnetization that is of the order of the voltage times the density of states at the Fermi surface (in units with $\mu_B = 1$). The transverse magnetization change is much smaller. As a result, there is no additional torque generated along the ferromagnet. All the torque comes at the interface.

When the material parameters on both sides are the same, we found

$$\begin{aligned} e\Delta J_M &= \beta J \cos(\Phi/2)\sin\Phi \\ &\times \frac{A_1 + 2\sqrt{1-\beta^2}\xi[1 + A_2 \sin^2(\Phi/2)/(1-\beta^2)] + \xi^2 4\sin^2\Phi/2}{1-\beta^2+2\sqrt{1-\beta^2}\xi + \xi^2\sin^2\Phi} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where ξ is the ratio of the conductance of the interface to that of the metal. A_1, A_2 are some dimensionless constants of the order of unity.

In summary, we argue that the magnetization current is not conserved at the interface of a heterostructure when the magnetizations on opposite sides of the structure are not collinear. This is due to the implicit assumption of a torque which creates a domain wall at the interface. This is illustrated with a steady state solution of the of the problem in the limit of linear response. In that limit, all the torque comes at the interface, no additional torque is introduced in the metal.

Z L was supported in part by China NNSF.

---

[1] T. Valet and A. Fert, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 7099 (1993).

[2] L. Berger, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 9353 (1996).

[3] J.C. Slonczewski, Phys. Rev. B**39**, 6995 (1989), Jour. Magn. Magn. Mater. **159**, L1 (1996); ibid., **195**, L261 (1999).

[4] J.A. Katine et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3149 (2000); F.J. Albert, J.A. Katine, R.A. Buhrman and D.C. Ralph, Appl. Phys. Lett. **77**, 3809 (2000); S.J.C.H. Theeuwen et al. Appl. Phys. Lett. **75**, 3677 (1999); E.B. Myers, D.C. Ralph, J.A. Katine, R.N. Louie, and R.A. Buhrman, Science **285**, 867 (1999).

[5] M. Tsoi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4281 (1998); Nature **406**, 46 (2000).

[6] See, for example, E. Merzbacher, *Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd Ed. Eq. (13.19) (John Wiley and Sons, 1970).

[7] M. H. Cohen, L. Falicov, and J. C. Philips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **8**, 316 (1962).

[8] See, for example, D. Mahan, *Many Particle Physics*, section 9.3, (Plenum Press, New York, 1990).

[9] This is basically eq. (9.39) in [8].

[10] M. Johnson and R. H. Silsbee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1790 (1985); M. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2142 (1993).

[11] P. C. van Son, H. Van Kempen and P. Wyder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2271 (1987)

[12] S.T. Chui, J. Appl. Phys. **80**, 1002 (1996); S.T. Chui, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R3832 (1995); S.T. Chui and J. Cullen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2118 (1995); S.T. Chui, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 5600 (1997); S.T. Chui, J-T Wang, Lei Zhou, K. Esfarjani and Y. Kawazoe, J. Phys. Conds. Matt. **13**, L49 (2001), S.T. Chui and L.B. Hu, Appl. Phys. Lett. **80**, 273 (2002).

[13] S. Englesberg and W. F. Brinkman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **21**, 1187 (1968); D. Langreth and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **6**, 3189 (1971).